DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 476 878 HE 035 901

TITLE	Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2003-04. Higher Education Update.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	CPEC-UP/03-01
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	11p.; For the 2002-2003 salary report, see ED 467 770.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1303 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814-2938. Tel: 916-322-9628. For full text: http://www.cpec.ca.gov.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Higher Education; *Public Colleges; *Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS	*California; California State University; University of California

ABSTRACT

This report contains information on faculty salaries at California's public universities for 2003-2004. The report describes the methodology used to calculate salary parity percentages and documents faculty salary increase trends over the past 22 years. The faculty salary methodology includes two separate comparison institution groups, one each for the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC). The methodology consists of collecting salary data from comparison institutions and then using a computational process that involves the weighting of several data elements by various factors, such as the number of faculty at each rank. During the first half of the 1980s, the salary lag between CSU and its comparison group was consistently smaller than the lag for UC and its comparison group, but by the late 1980s, this situation had reversed. In the economic recession between 1991-1992 and 1994-1995, few if any faculty salary increases were funded, which worsened the compensation deficiency between faculty at California's public institutions and their comparison groups to create the largest compensation disparity since the inflationary era of the 1970s and early 1980s. Current budget constraints suggest that faculty at both UC and CSU are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases in 2003-2004. The implications of this finding may put both universities at a disadvantage when retaining or recruiting new faculty to meet the needs of students. It is possible that the current national recession will temper the negative effects of small or no salary increases because so many institutions in the United States will be in the same position. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 476 878

Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2003-04

California Postsecondary Education Commission

April 2003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Ratliff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

HE 035 901

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HIGHER EDUCATION UPDATE

NUMBER UP/03-01
APRIL 2003

News from the
CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

Alan Arkatov, *Chair*
Howard Welinsky, *Vice Chair*
George T. Caplan
Carol Chandler
Irwin S. Field
Odessa P. Johnson
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Evonne Seron Schulze
Rachel E. Shetka
Olivia K. Singh
Anthony M. Vitti
Faye Washington

Robert L. Moore
Executive Director

1303 J Street, Suite 500
Sacramento, California 95814-2938
Telephone (916) 445-7933 (Voice)
FAX Number (916) 327-4417

HE03591

Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2003-04

ANNUALLY, in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 of the 1965 General Legislative Session, the California State University and the University of California submit to the California Postsecondary Education Commission information on faculty salaries for their respective institutions and for a set of comparison colleges and universities located primarily outside of California.

Commission staff develops estimates of the percentage changes in faculty salaries in California public universities that will enable them to attain parity with their respective comparison groups in the forthcoming fiscal year. These final parity figures for both systems are based on complete data from the comparison institutions. A preliminary estimate of faculty salary parity was reported to the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst last December. This information is brought to the Commission for adoption in time for the Governor's May Revise of the State Budget.

This report contains a brief description of the methodology employed to calculate the parity percentages, and the faculty salary increase trends over the past 22 years. Supplemental Budget Language adopted by the Legislature in 1998 precludes changes in the methodology prior to the 2002-03 budget cycle. Because of the lengthy lead times required to develop the Governor's Budget, if any changes in the methodology are contemplated for the 2004-05 cycle, discussions among the members of the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee should begin in the spring or summer of 2003.

A summary of the methodology

The faculty salary methodology includes two separate comparison institution groups – one each for the California State University and the University of California. The procedures by which the systems collect data, and the techniques used to analyze those data, have been designed and refined periodically by the Commission in consultation with the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee. The Committee includes representatives from the California State University, University of California, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst, with the California Faculty Association included on the Committee as an observer. As a result, the faculty salary methodology is reflective of several compromises among interested parties, rather than the vision of any single individual or agency.

This year's methodology is unchanged from the last several years, and can be found in considerable detail in several previous Commission reports. These include the June 1987 report *Faculty Salary Revisions* (CPEC 87-27), the June 1989 report *Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology* (CPEC 89-22), and the 1997 faculty salary report (CPEC 97-2), which includes the most recent 1996-97 adjustments.

The methodology consists of two primary elements: (1) collecting salary data from comparison institutions; and (2) a computational process that involves the weighting of several data elements by various factors, such as the number of faculty at each rank.

Display 1 below shows the comparison institutions for the two university systems. The members of the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee formulated each list through extensive discussions and compromises. In the more than 38 years that the survey has been conducted, each list has changed several times, most recently in 1993-94 when three institutions in the State University comparison group were replaced. The University of California list is unchanged since 1988.

The computational process includes a determination of current average salaries, by rank, in both the California systems and the comparison institutions, with each rank's average projected forward one year based on the previous five-year growth rate. The projected 2003-04 average rank-by-rank salaries for the comparison institutions are then compared to the current-year State University and University averages. These averages are then combined into an "All Ranks Average" for each comparison group and each California system and compared for the current and budget years. Comparing the projected average for the comparison group next year with the current-year average for the California system produces the budget-year "parity figure."

Faculty salary trends

Display 2 on the next page shows the Commission's salary computations for each of the two public university systems, plus the actual amounts granted, since the 1981-82 fiscal year.

During the first half of the 1980s, the salary lag between CSU and its comparison group was consistently smaller than the comparable lag for UC and its group. However, by the late 1980s, this situation had reversed. During California's severe economic recession between 1991-92 and 1994-95, few if any faculty salary increases were funded in the State budget. This worsened the compensation deficiency between faculty at California's public institutions and their comparison groups to create the largest compensation disparity since the inflationary era of the 1970s and early 1980s.

When California moved from recession to economic boom in the mid 1990s, faculty received more competitive percentage salary increases, with slightly larger increases accruing to faculty at the California State University. As a result of this trend, the parity figure declined significantly during this period for faculty at both univer-

DISPLAY 1 Faculty Salary Comparison Institutions for the California State University and the University of California

The California State University

Northeast Region
- Bucknell University*
- Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, Newark
- State University of New York, Albany
- Tufts University*
- University of Connecticut

North Central Region
- Cleveland State University
- Illinois State University
- Loyola University, Chicago*
- Wayne State University
- University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Southern Region
- Georgia State University
- George Mason University
- North Carolina State University
- University of Maryland, Baltimore County

Western Region
- Arizona State University
- Reed College*
- University of Colorado, Denver
- University of Nevada, Reno
- University of Southern California*
- University of Texas, Arlington

University of California
- Harvard University*
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology*
- Stanford University*
- State University of New York, Buffalo
- University of Illinois, Urbana
- University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
- University of Virginia, Charlottesville
- Yale University*

* Independent Institution.

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

DISPLAY 2 Comparison of Faculty Salary Parity Figures, with Actual Percentage Increases Provided, 1981-82 Through 2003-04

	The California State University		University of California	
Year	Parity Figure	Salary Increase	Parity Figure	Salary Increase
1981-82	0.5%	6.0%	5.8%	6.0%
1982-83	2.3	0.0	9.8	0.0
1983-84	9.2	6.0	18.5	7.0
1984-85	7.6	10.0	10.6	9.0
1985-86	N/A	10.5	6.5	9.5
1986-87	6.9	6.8	1.4	5.0
1987-88	6.9	6.9	2.0	5.6
1988-89	4.7	4.7	3.0	3.0
1989-90	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
1990-91	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
1991-92	4.1	0.0	3.5	0.0
1992-93	6.0	0.0	6.7	0.0
1993-94	8.5	3.0	6.5	0.0
1994-95	6.8	0.0	12.6	3.0
1995-96	12.7	2.5	10.4	3.0
1996-97	9.6	4.0	10.3	5.0
1997-98	10.8	4.0	6.7	5.0
1998-99	11.2	5.7	4.6	4.5
1999-00	11.1	6.0	2.9	2.9
2000-01	8.9	6.0	3.0	3.0
2001-02	7.9	3.1	3.9	0.5
2002-03	10.6	3.0	7.7	0.5
2003-04	11.6	N/A	8.8	N/A

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission

sity systems. However recent and anticipated budget constraints have reversed the trend once again. The University of California's parity gap last year was 7.7%, while the currently projected lag grew to 8.8% for 2003-04. At the State University, faculty this year received an average salary increase of 3.0%; however, the lag increased from 10.6% last year to a projected 11.6% for the 2003-04 fiscal year.

It is important to understand the meaning of these "parity" numbers. Last year, when the Commission reported an estimated lag of 10.6% for CSU faculty, it did not mean that the State University's faculty was actually paid that percent less than their colleagues at comparable institutions. This figure was a projection of a possible future (2002-03) increase based on observed trends over a five-year period, with the assumption that State University salaries would not increase at all in the 2002-03 fiscal year. The current lag -- discussed below for 2002-03 -- can be quite different from the projected lag, and normally shows a lower percentage than anticipated for the budget year, with the potential of there being no lag at all.

The parity figures for 2003-04

California State University

Display 3 on the next page shows the parity calculations for the California State University for the current (2002-03) and budget (2003-04) years.

The "parity figure" for the State University system for 2003-04 is 11.6% -- the percentage by which average salaries in the State University would have to increase to equal the average salaries projected to be paid by the comparison institutions in 2003-04. It indicates that the all ranks average salary in the current year is about 7.7% below that currently paid by the comparison group. These calculations are based upon actual information received from all of the State University's 20 comparison institutions. Comparative salaries were preliminary for one institution that was reconciling its database at the time of publication of this report.

Displays 4 and 5 on the following pages show rank-by-rank and institution-by-institution salaries for both the State University and the comparison group for 1997-98 and 2002-03. These data are used to determine the five-year compounded average growth rate that permits current-year salaries to be projected into the budget year. The shaded lines in both displays indicate the State University's position for each rank and for all ranks relative to the entire list. It shows that in 2002-03 on average all State University faculty placed 12th in their ranking with the comparison institution counterparts -- directly at the median.

For the current year, faculty at the professor and assistant professor levels rank below the median, at the 17th place. Associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors placed at 10th, 15th, and 8th places respectively. The overall average for all faculty is at the median is because the State University has 47.8% of its faculty at the full professor rank, while the comparison institutions, as a group, have 36.9% of their faculty at that rank.

DISPLAY 3 California State University Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1997-98 and 2002-03; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2003-04; and Projected CSU Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2003-04

Academic Rank	Comparison Group Average Salaries 1997-98[1]	Comparison Group Average Salaries 2002-03[1]	Compound Rate of Increase	Comparison Group Projected Salaries 2003-04
Professor	$79,474	$95,301	3.7%	$98,827
Associate Professor	$57,651	$68,874	3.6%	$71,368
Assistant Professor	$47,432	$57,103	3.8%	$59,262
Instructor	$37,280	$40,095	1.5%	$40,683

Academic Rank	California State University Actual Average Salaries 2002-03	Comparison Group Average Salaries Actual 2002-03	Comparison Group Average Salaries Projected 2003-04	Percentage Increase Required in California State University Average Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average Actual 2002-03	Percentage Increase Required in California State University Average Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average Projected 2003-04
Professor	$83,409	$95,301	$98,827	14.3%	18.5%
Associate Professor	$67,303	$68,874	$71,368	2.3%	6.0%
Assistant Professor	$54,004	$57,103	$59,262	5.7%	9.7%
Instructor	$41,686	$40,095	$40,683	-3.8%	-2.4%
Weighted by State University Staffing	$69,812	$76,622	$79,418	9.8%	13.8%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	$68,597	$74,257	$76,962	8.3%	12.2%
All Ranks Average and *Net Percentage Amount*[2]	$69,508	$74,849	$77,576	**7.7%**	**11.6%**

Institutional Current-Year Staffing Pattern (Headcount Faculty)	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total
California State University	5,630	2,073	3,521	558	11,782
Percent	*47.8%*	*17.6%*	*29.9%*	*4.7%*	
Comparison Institutions	4,764	4,123	3,463	546	12,896
Percent	*36.9%*	*32.0%*	*26.9%*	*4.2%*	

1. Weighted 58% high-cost institutions, 42% low-cost institutions.

2. "All-Ranks Average" salaries are derived by weighting the State University and Comparison Institutions by 75 % of their own staffing pattern and 25% of the comparison institution's staffing pattern.

Source: CPEC staff analysis

DISPLAY 4 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 1997-98

Institution	Professors No.	Professors Average Salary (rank)	Associate Professors No.	Associate Professors Average Salary (rank)	Assistant Professors No.	Assistant Professors Average Salary (rank)	Instructors No.	Instructors Average Salary (rank)	Total	Weighted Ave. Salary (rank)
Institution B[1]	456	$88,295 (3)	349	$64,544 (2)	190	$50,081 (4)	10	$40,154 (7)	1,005	$72,344 (1)
Institution Q[1]	489	89,137 (2)	354	63,050 (3)	237	54,926 (2)	48	46,667 (3)	1,128	71,955 (2)
Institution J[1]	131	92,395 (1)	119	68,564 (1)	105	55,242 (1)	19	41,624 (6)	374	71,802 (3)
Institution P[1]	118	83,508 (6)	125	61,479 (4)	51	46,434 (8)	2	53,500 (1)	296	67,615 (4)
Institution K	460	79,856 (8)	348	57,236 (9)	193	50,551 (3)	7	39,350 (8)	1,008	66,154 (5)
Institution N	247	79,542 (9)	202	56,623 (11)	90	45,198 (15)	0	0 --	539	65,218 (6)
Institution R[1]	245	85,797 (4)	269	59,940 (5)	146	45,682 (13)	63	42,001 (5)	723	64,260 (7)
Institution M[1]	158	78,558 (10)	139	57,154 (10)	103	45,656 (14)	4	26,712 (18)	404	62,292 (8)
Institution S[1]	263	78,008 (11)	251	59,180 (6)	206	46,957 (6)	21	42,678 (4)	741	61,997 (9)
Institution G[1]	157	80,000 (7)	224	56,400 (12)	118	45,700 (12)	0	0 --	499	61,295 (10)
CSU	**6,587**	**$68,313 (17)**	**2,008**	**$55,284 (13)**	**1,746**	**$44,475 (17)**	**217**	**$35,032 (12)**	**10,558**	**$61,209 (11)**
Institution F	222	84,822 (5)	260	57,571 (7)	262	47,636 (5)	38	37,974 (9)	782	61,026 (12)
Institution A	610	74,124 (13)	458	55,045 (14)	248	45,830 (11)	60	28,820 (17)	1,376	60,699 (13)
Institution C	81	76,668 (12)	101	57,329 (8)	77	46,730 (7)	2	47,738 (2)	261	60,130 (14)
Institution L	50	69,195 (15)	27	50,766 (19)	27	43,345 (18)	0	0 --	104	57,699 (15)
Institution T	265	66,923 (18)	310	53,327 (15)	123	45,981 (10)	5	36,582 (10)	703	57,048 (16)
Institution I[1]	118	73,210 (14)	131	51,264 (17)	92	45,135 (16)	21	31,840 (14)	362	55,733 (17)
Institution D	172	66,340 (20)	220	51,169 (18)	98	41,997 (20)	8	32,666 (13)	498	54,307 (18)
Institution O	201	66,501 (19)	205	49,693 (20)	151	42,930 (19)	3	28,999 (16)	560	53,791 (19)
Institution E[1]	120	68,785 (16)	124	51,942 (16)	110	46,106 (9)	56	35,941 (11)	410	53,120 (20)
Institution H	280	61,526 (21)	200	48,430 (21)	210	40,591 (21)	11	30,395 (15)	701	51,030 (21)
Totals	4,843	$78,267	4,416	$57,011	2,837	$47,085	378	$37,774	12,474	$62,423
High cost 10	2,255	$83,907	2,085	$60,145	1,358	$48,868	244	$40,450	6,756	$57,852
Low cost 10	2,588	73,352	2,331	54,207	1,479	45,448	134	32,901	5,718	67,824
Total	**4,843**	**$79,474**	**4,416**	**$57,651**	**2,837**	**$47,432**	**378**	**$37,280**	**12,474**	**$62,040**

1. Universities located in higher cost areas.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DISPLAY 5 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 2002-03

Institution	Professors No.	Professors Average Salary (rank)	Associate Professors No.	Associate Professors Average Salary (rank)	Assistant Professors No.	Assistant Professors Average Salary (rank)	Instructors No.	Instructors Average Salary (rank)	Total	Weighted Ave. Salary (rank)
Institution Q[1]	540	$110,754 (2)	335	$77,840 (4)	247	$68,926 (1)	46	$45,112 (4)	1,168	$89,883 (1)
Institution J[1]	126	111,453 (1)	95	81,394 (1)	71	63,990 (2)	31	43,221 (6)	323	85,630 (2)
Institution B[1]	433	105,419 (4)	356	78,226 (3)	288	62,021 (3)	15	64,832 (1)	1,092	84,551 (3)
Institution P[1]	132	97,927 (5)	125	79,560 (2)	71	56,863 (7)	0	0 --	328	82,039 (4)
Institution K	488	94,394 (10)	340	68,481 (7)	256	60,235 (4)	10	47,516 (3)	1,094	77,919 (5)
Institution N	229	95,276 (9)	196	67,007 (11)	142	56,294 (9)	0	0 --	567	75,741 (6)
Institution M[1]	170	96,031 (8)	159	69,460 (6)	135	52,295 (19)	11	38,948 (10)	475	73,385 (7)
Institution A	617	89,439 (12)	416	63,640 (16)	291	56,452 (8)	45	34,814 (14)	1,369	72,792 (8)
Institution R[1]	263	97,732 (6)	271	68,252 (8)	251	53,243 (16)	90	43,067 (7)	875	70,217 (9)
Institution C	68	96,800 (7)	109	70,107 (5)	116	54,703 (13)	0	0 --	293	70,203 (10)
Institution S[1,2]	284	85,870 (13)	188	66,939 (12)	186	54,416 (14)	37	44,303 (5)	695	70,118 (11)
CSU	**5,630**	**$83,409 (17)**	**2,073**	**$67,303 (10)**	**3,521**	**$54,004 (15)**	**558**	**$41,686 (8)**	**11,782**	**$69,812 (12)**
Institution I[1]	130	93,038 (11)	128	64,943 (15)	128	55,613 (12)	22	39,622 (9)	408	69,602 (13)
Institution F	170	109,602 (3)	282	68,104 (9)	299	57,160 (5)	109	37,502 (11)	860	68,624 (14)
Institution T	236	83,621 (16)	267	65,275 (13)	242	56,943 (6)	10	36,830 (12)	755	67,962 (15)
Institution L	54	82,461 (18)	22	62,231 (17)	46	53,243 (17)	0	0 --	122	67,796 (16)
Institution G[1]	159	86,686 (15)	201	61,133 (19)	58	52,940 (18)	0	0 --	418	69,716 (17)
Institution O	193	80,396 (20)	163	60,177 (20)	132	55,632 (11)	0	0 --	488	66,944 (18)
Institution D	155	80,888 (19)	186	61,346 (18)	108	46,564 (21)	1	60,000 (2)	450	64,526 (19)
Institution E[1]	108	87,235 (14)	114	65,187 (14)	112	56,083 (10)	119	36,780 (13)	453	60,730 (20)
Institution H	209	70,962 (21)	170	55,571 (21)	284	48,814 (20)	0	0 --	663	57,528 (21)
Totals	4,764	$94,352	4,123	$68,145	3,463	$56,663	546	$40,545	12,896	$73,574
High cost 10	2,345	$99,846	1,972	$71,886	1,547	$58,489	371	$41,994	6,235	$77,299
Low cost 10	2,419	89,026	2,151	64,715	1,916	55,189	175	37,473	6,661	64,352
Total	**4,764**	**$95,301**	**4,123**	**$68,874**	**3,463**	**$57,103**	**546**	**$40,095**	**12,896**	**$71,861**

1. Universities located in higher cost areas.

2. Preliminary data

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of California

This report contains current-year data from all of the University of California's eight comparison institutions.

Display 6 on the next page shows the parity calculations for UC for both the current and budget years. For the University system, the methodology indicates a "parity figure" of 8.8%, which is the percentage amount by which UC faculty will lag their counterparts if no salary increase is granted for 2003-04. The display also shows that University average salaries lag the comparison group by 4.1% in the 2002-03 fiscal year.

Display 7 presents 1997-98 and 2002-03 comparison institution data, by rank, and indicates that the University has slightly improved the relative strength of its median position over the five-year period. Five years ago, roughly $4,500 separated University salaries from the institution just below it; today the University's average is about $3,600 higher than that institution. There is no change from last year in the public/independent relationship relative to faculty salaries – that is, each of the private comparison institutions pays more on average while each public comparator pays less.

The Universities rank-by-rank position relative to its comparison institutions is more consistent than it is with the State University. For example, where in the current year the University's all-ranks average is at the median – fifth of nine listed, including the University of California – of the comparison institutions listed, it is sixth for full professors, sixth for associate professors, and fourth for assistant professors. The consistency of the University's position occurs because the distribution of faculty at each professorial rank in that system is similar to the distribution of faculty at its eight comparison institutions.

Issues of competitiveness

The Commission believes that any salary increase provided to faculty should take into consideration its impact on students, including the quantity and quality of faculty. However, current budget constraints suggest that faculty at both the California State University and the University of California are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases in 2003-04 commensurate with the estimated lag of their respective comparison institutions, in large part because of the significant budget shortfall the State is facing during both the current and budgeted fiscal years. The implications of no or minimal salary increases might put both the State University and the University at a disadvantage when retaining existing or recruiting new faculty who are critical to meeting the needs of students. If the lag is too disparate, both University systems could lose their best scholars to institutions offering more competitive salaries. Similarly, when recruiting new faculty, both systems must offer competitive packages to recent graduates and to highly prized scholars working elsewhere to make their offers most attractive. A reduction in the number of existing faculty, or an institution's inability to attract qualified scholars, could affect student access and undermine the quality of academic programs.

The current national recession may temper the negative effects of small or no salary increases on the University and State University in the short term, in that many public and private institutions throughout the nation are also facing limited salary increases, in large part because of major budget shortfalls in other states. However, once the national economy improves, the State must consider what levels of compensation are best for recruiting and retaining faculty. Likewise, the State should recognize that compensation is only one factor that faculty use when considering job offers. Other externalities such as cost of housing, quality of life, and climate often affect a faculty member's decision when accepting a new position. The Commission's parity calculations for the University and State University provide only one measure of institutional competitiveness for employing such faculty.

DISPLAY 6 University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1997-98 and 2002-03; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2003-04; and Projected UC Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2003-04

Academic Rank	Comparison Group Average Salaries 1997-98[1]	Comparison Group Average Salaries 2002-03[1]	Compound Rate of Increase	Comparison Group Projected Salaries, 2003-04
Professor	$96,499	$119,389	4.3%	$124,582
Associate Professor	$64,059	$80,783	4.7%	$84,619
Assistant Professor	$53,588	$67,577	4.7%	$70,786

Academic Rank	University of Calif. Average Salaries, 2002-03	Comparison Group Average Salaries Actual 2002-03	Comparison Group Average Salaries Projected 2003-04	Percent Increase Required in University Ave. Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average Actual 2002-03	Percent Increase Required in University Ave. Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average Projected 2003-04
Professor	$112,032	$119,389	$124,582	6.6%	11.2%
Associate Professor	$73,082	$80,783	$84,619	10.5%	15.8%
Assistant Professor	$64,800	$67,577	$70,786	4.3%	9.2%
Weighted by University of California Staffing	$96,163	$102,784	$107,365	6.9%	11.6%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	$91,293	$97,519	$101,900	6.8%	11.6%
All Ranks Average/Net Percentage Amount[2]	**$94,945**	**$98,835**	**$103,266**	**4.1%**	**8.8%**

Institutional Budget-Year Staffing Pattern, (Full-Time-Equivalent Faculty)	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total
University of California	3,984.8	1,233.5	1,108.5	6,326.9
Percent	*63.0%*	*19.5%*	*17.5%*	*100.0%*
Comparison Institutions	4,333.4	1,767.4	2,177.4	8,278.2
Percent	*52.3%*	*21.3%*	*26.3%*	*100.0%*

1. Weighted 50% public comparison institutions, 50% independent comparison institutions. The University of California Office of the President reports that it has final survey results from seven of its eight comparison institutions and has estimated final results for the eighth institution.
2. All-Ranks Average derived by weighting University and Comparison Institutions by 75 percent of their own staffing pattern and 25 percent of the other's staffing pattern.

Source: CPEC staff analysis

DISPLAY 7 University of California Comparison Institution Average Salaries and Ranking, 1997-98 and 2002-03

1997-98	Type[1]	Professor		Rank	Associate Professor		Rank	Assistant Professor		Rank	Total Faculty		Rank
		Number	Salary		Number	Salary		Number	Salary		Number	Salary	
Institution A	I	495	$108,751	2	136	$74,769	1	165	$59,787	2	796	$92,795	2
Institution H	I	605	112,639	1	133	63,202	4	183	58,723	3	921	94,787	1
Institution F	I	547	104,674	3	163	70,373	2	174	60,898	1	884	89,733	3
Institution D	I	364	103,046	4	95	60,804	6	176	50,056	7	635	82,039	4
Univ. of Calif.	**P**	**3,290**	**93,697**	**5**	**1,204**	**62,695**	**5**	**1,070**	**54,986**	**4**	**5,563**	**79,545**	**5**
Institution E	P	700	88,616	6	370	65,239	3	345	51,104	5	1,415	73,357	6
Institution B	P	432	86,676	7	262	59,788	7	224	49,198	8	919	69,865	7
Institution G	P	840	82,489	9	494	58,211	8	376	50,575	6	1,709	68,459	8
Institution C	P	296	82,808	8	218	56,313	9	161	46,335	9	675	65,549	9
Totals		**4,279.0**	**$96,499**		**1,871.5**	**$64,059**		**1,803.5**	**$53,588**		**7,954.0**	**$80,100**	

2002-03	Type[1]	Professor		Rank	Associate Professor		Rank	Assistant Professor		Rank	Total Faculty		Rank
		Number	Salary		Number	Salary		Number	Salary		Number	Salary	
Institution H	I	607	$145,572	1	109	$88,776	2	240	$78,784	1	956	$122,329	1
Institution A	I	500	131,364	2	136	96,508	1	202	75,159	3	838	112,159	2
Institution F	I	553	127,494	4	173	86,886	3	183	78,646	2	909	109,932	3
Institution D	I	407	129,102	3	68	79,338	5	199	63,993	6	674	104,858	4
Univ. of Calif.	**P**	**3,985**	**112,032**	**6**	**1,234**	**73,082**	**6**	**1,109**	**64,800**	**4**	**6,327**	**96,163**	**5**
Institution E	P	698	113,499	5	339	79,032	4	405	64,615	5	1,442	91,667	6
Institution B	P	470	102,548	7	263	70,092	7	229	58,358	9	961	83,156	7
Institution G	P	812	99,843	9	442	68,986	9	504	59,908	7	1,758	80,634	8
Institution C	P	287	100,743	8	237	73,036	8	216	58,696	8	740	79,596	9
Total		**4,333.4**	**$119,389**		**1,767.4**	**$80,783**		**2,177.4**	**$67,577**		**8,278.2**	**$98,600**	

1. I =Independent; P = Public.

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").